

6 D

OUR

ORANGE OPPONENTS

BY

E. P. S. COUNSEL

BARRISTER-AT-LAW

GRADUATE OF TRINITY COLLEGE, DUBLIN

“Truth is stranger than fiction.”

DUBLIN

M. H. GILL AND SON

O'CONNELL STREET

1886

Price Sixpence.

BOSTON PUBLIC LIBRARY

PUBLIC FUNDS

OUR
ORANGE OPPONENTS

BY

E. P. S. COUNSEL

BARRISTER-AT-LAW

GRADUATE OF TRINITY COLLEGE, DUBLIN

“Truth is stranger than fiction.”

DUBLIN
M. H. GILL AND SON
O'CONNELL STREET
1886

RB DA990. V46 C64 1886x
Acc. 95-349

*Examination of the Nature of the Opposition to a
Dublin Parliament as Disclosed by Ulster
Speech and Dublin Pamphlet.*

“ You,” the Orangemen of Ulster, “ *form the first line of defence, the second line of defence, and the last line of defence*” against the establishment of a Parliament in Dublin. Such is the statement of an ex-Cabinet Minister, of one who, for a time, aided in ruling the mightiest empire of ancient or modern times—who is yet one of the acknowledged leaders of the Conservative party ! And this definition of the Irish opposition made advisedly in an address which the ex-Minister travelled many hundred miles to deliver, which the statesman had weeks to ponder over, is not disputed by the Orangemen who met Lord Churchill (they cheered the statement), and is accepted by the Conservative Press. The *Standard*, in its issue of the 23rd February, affirmed that this assertion of Lord Churchill’s is true, and that the Orangemen are the only persons striving against the grant of local government to Ireland. We have, then, no option but to accept this—their own—description as correct.

Now, in arriving at an estimate of the nature of the opposition it is not enough to know who are the opponents, we should also try to form some idea as to whether, in their hostility, they are inspired by patriotism and love of country, or by personal motives and blind sectarian hate. This we can fairly do by considering the form of the appeal made to them by one who knew their feelings and motives, seems to have studied the history of their association—assumes to know their watchword, their “forms and ceremonies,” “memories and traditions,” and, above all, how in the districts of Ulster they “assiduously trimmed the lamp of civil and religious liberty.” It was in the name of those memories and traditions, in the name of their past, that Lord Randolph Churchill made his appeal, amidst wild applause from the brethren of the Orange lodges.

What, then, was the nature of that past? What memories and traditions were those? Are they of deeds of goodness, self-devotion, self-sacrifice, generosity, patriotism, or valour—those deeds whose memories so thrill the hearts of the Orangemen? Are they deeds whose record constitutes a nation’s pride, throws a halo round her past, and is the incentive to still better, nobler actions, to glorify her future? In a word, what was the conduct, in what consisted the claim to posterity’s gratitude of the Orange ancestors of those who are to rivet upon themselves the attention of the demo-

cracy of England—what are the deeds which the present representatives of past Orangeism are to emulate?

To arrive at a clear understanding on this head it is necessary that I should give a sketch of the position of the Catholics of Ireland, from the reign of William III. to the date of the foundation of the first Orange Lodge in Ireland.

In the reigns of William III. and Anne, a series of Acts* were passed for the suppression of the Irish Catholics, forming in the words of Hallam,†

<p>* 7 Wm. III. chap. 4, sec. 9, Enacted that no person whatsoever of the Popish religion shall publicly or in private houses, teach school or instruct youth in learning within this realm upon the pain of £20, and also of being committed to prison without bail or mainprize for three months for every such offence.</p>	<p>value of £5, to certain penalties.</p>
--	---

<p>7 Wm. III. chap. 5, sec. 10, Subjecting any Papist, who shall, after 20th January 1695, have or keep in his possession or that of anyone else for his use any horse, gelding, or mare which shall be of the</p>	<p>9 Wm. III. chap. 1, sec. 1, Enacted that all Popish archbishops, bishops, vicars-general, deans, Jesuits, monks, friars, and all other regular Popish clergy, and all Papists exercising any ecclesiastical jurisdiction shall depart out of this kingdom before the 1st of May, 1698; and if any of the said ecclesiastical persons shall be at any time after the said 1st of May within this kingdom they and every of them shall suffer imprisonment without bail or mainprize till he or they be trans-</p>
--	---

† Hallam, Con. Hist., vol. III. p. 395.

“a system of oppression contained in a series of laws which have scarce a parallel in European history.” This code would, if printed *in extenso*, fill a volume, and I can only give the reader a few sections out of some of these Acts. I give them without

ported beyond the seas to forfeit £20; for the second, wherever his Majesty or the £40; and for the third offence governors of the kingdom to forfeit all his goods and shall think fit; and if any chattels and lands and tene- person so transported shall ments of inheritance or free- return again into this king- hold, one moiety not to exceed dom they shall be guilty of £100 to go to such person as high treason, and every per- shall inform; the residue to son so offending shall for his the Crown [payment of fines offence be judged a traytor, enforced by imprisonment till and shall suffer, lose, and paid].

Sec. 3. Provided that no Popish ecclesiastics or any other Papists exercising ecclesiastical jurisdiction should, after 29th Dec., 1697, come into the kingdom on pain of twelve months' imprisonment, and then to be transported as aforesaid, and, returning into this kingdom, to be guilty of high treason and suffer accordingly.

Sec. 4. Any person knowingly relieving or concealing such Popish clergy after 1st May, 1698, for the first offence

By Sec. 6. No person is, after 29th Dec., 1697, to bury any dead in any suppress monastery, abbey, or convent that is not made use of for celebrating Divine service according to the liturgy of the Church of Ireland or within the precincts thereof, upon pain of forfeiting £10—one moiety to go to the informer: such sum to be recoverable from any person present at such burial

2 Anne, chap. 3. Makes all Popish clergymen coming into the kingdom and those harbouring them liable to penal-

comment. They require no explanation: every one can understand them, and so be able to have some idea of the position of the Catholics during their continuance.

Besides the enactments given herein there were others, "tempting the eldest son of a Catholic to conform to the Protestant faith to secure the heritage; breaking up the properties of those who refused to conform, and holding out great temptations to profligacy and undutiful conduct in Catholic families." These words are not mine; they

ties and punishment imposed on ecclesiastics by the 9 Wm. III., chap. 1.

2 Anne, chap. 6, sec. 1. Provides that if any person should induce a Protestant to become a Catholic or to be reconciled to the Church of Rome, then every such person and every such Protestant so reconciled to Popery shall incur the danger and penalty of premunire mentioned in statute of premunire made in England, 16 Richard II.

Sec. 2. Every Papist who should send, or suffer to be sent, any child under the age of 21 years, except sailors or ship boys or the apprentice of a merchant in trade of merchandise, into France or

beyond the seas without a certain special licence should incur the pains and penalties imposed by "Act to restrain Foreign Education," made in 7 Wm. III.

Sec. 6. Papists were rendered incapable of buying and purchasing, either in their own names or in the *names of others* for their own use or benefit, any interest in land save by leasing same for not more than 31 years, and at a rent of not less than 2-3rds of the improved yearly value at the time of making said lease.

Sec. 7. Declared that if the heir at law of a Protestant dying possessed of lands were a Papist he could not succeed to the lands unless he became a

are used by Leckie,* the historian, in describing the effect of the Irish penal laws.

One can understand from this how completely the law placed the Catholics, five-sixths of the Irish people, out of reach of the benefits of the English Constitution, which, Hallam tells us, "was in theory at least accorded to Ireland." And this, too, although that very constitution was obtained by the struggles of the Catholic—"The declaration of right itself being almost entirely declaratory of

Protestant, but the lands should go to the next Protestant who would be heir if Catholics were all dead.

Sec. 23. Enacted: that no Papists should or might, after the 24th March, 1703, take or purchase any house or tenement or come to dwell or inhabit within the city of Limerick or its suburbs, or within the town of Galway or its suburbs, and every person of the Popish religion now inhabiting same should, before the 24th March, 1703, become bound to her Majesty with two sufficient sureties in a reasonable penal sum: in default of giving such security such person to leave the city.

8 Anne, chap. 3, sec. 16. Enacted: That whatsoever person of the Popish religion shall publicly teach school or shall instruct youth in learning in any private house within this realm or be entertained to instruct youth in learning as usher, undermaster, or assistant by any Protestant schoolmaster, he shall be esteemed and taken to be a Popish clergyman and to be prosecuted as such and incur such penalties as any Popish regular convict.

Sec. 20. To encourage discoverers and render effectual the penal statutes—

Enacted: That if any person shall discover any archbishop,

* Leckie's Const. History, vol. IV., p. 479.

the rights and privileges secured by the Catholic ancestors of the English people." The entire of this code continued in force down to the year 1778, between which year and 1794, many of its worst clauses were repealed, and Catholics were on conditions allowed certain rights, as to acquisition and disposition of property, and the educa-

bishop, &c., or any other regular Popish clergyman, or any Papist exercising any ecclesiastical jurisdiction. . . .

or any Popish schoolmaster, or any Papist teaching in private houses as tutor, or usher, or assistant to any Protestant schoolmaster so as the said regular clergyman Popish schoolmaster, usher, or assistant be apprehended and legally convicted, every person making such discovery shall receive as a reward for the same the sums following—£50 for every archbishop, bishop, or vicar-general, £20 for each regular clergyman, £10 for each Popish schoolmaster, usher, or assistant: to be leveyed on the Popish inhabitants of the county or town where such person officiated, taught, or most commonly resided, and to be leveyed as provided by Act

against tories, robbers, and rapparees.

Sec. 21. Subjects to fine and imprisonment any Papist refusing to appear and testify on oath before justices where and when he heard Mass celebrated as usual in Church of Rome, and the names of the persons celebrating and present at it, and the residence of any Popish ecclesiastic.

Sec. 22. Registered secular priests to take oath of abjuration before 25th March, 1710.

Sec. 37. Enacted: That (except in the hempen or flaxen manufacture) no Papists, who are or shall be permitted to follow any trade, craft, or mystery, shall hereafter take or keep more than two apprentices at a time, and that for no less than a term of seven years under a penalty of £100 to be recoverable by the prosecutor.

tion of their children—the law thus, in some respects though conditionally, placing them on a level with their Protestant neighbours. All restrictions were not, however, removed and full rights granted to them, till the year 1829, when Ireland obtained, from the justice of England, Catholic Emancipation.

Thus, in 1795 Catholics were practically on an equality with Protestants *as to rights in land*. This being so, and the Catholics being admitted to share in some degree the blessings and privileges of the Constitution, we find the Orange Society established by the foundation of an Orange Lodge in Armagh in 1795. *You have the establishment of the Orange Society following almost directly the grant to Catholics of rights over land*. I so far merely state this as a fact, from which alone no conclusion can be drawn !

But should we find, immediately following a grant of rights, a society established *for the purpose of depriving the objects of the grant of those rights*, we might not unreasonably draw the conclusion

<p>I. Geo. II. ch. 20, sec. 1. Barristers, solicitors, attorneys, and officers of the courts to have taken declarations against Transubstantiation, and subscribed to oaths mentioned in an "Act to prevent the further growth of Popery."</p>	<p>Acts against ecclesiastics, but (sec. 8) excepts "ecclesiastics officiating in church or chapel with steeple or bell, or at funerals in church or churchyard, &c., or using mark of ecclesiastical authority, or taking ecclesiastical rank or title."</p>
--	---

21 & 22 Geo. III., ch. 24. Only partially repeals Penal

that the grant of the rights was the cause of the foundation of the society. What, then, was *the purpose* of the founders of the Orange Society?

Plowden, who wrote in 1811, tells us that the members of this society were originally Protestants, and that they were sworn, and he* gives us the oath, as administered in 1795, and for at any rate some years later. It was in these words: "I, A.B., do swear that I will be true to King and Government, and that I will exterminate the Catholics of Ireland as far as lies in my power."

We have here a statement of the purpose, the object, of the Orange Society, made on evidence gathered within 16 years of its foundation, and we have this statement corroborated and accepted by Madden† and Walpole.‡ We further have from all three historians accounts and evidence of the efforts of the then newly banded Protestant Orangemen of Ulster to exterminate, and of the partial extermination of, the Catholics. I shall not attempt to give any idea of the way in which this was done—of the amount of suffering and death which followed this inhuman attempt to trample out those the survivors of the terrible penal laws. I shall only say that these authors give detailed and harrowing particulars. They prove that this conduct was *systematic, deliberate, and general*.

* Plowden's Hist. Ireland, 1811

† Madden's United Irishmen.

‡ C. H. Walpole—Kingdom of Ireland.

But there may be exaggeration in these statements, weakness in these proofs ! Party or private feeling might bias the historian. We should be slow indeed to credit the justice of such a charge. This account of the foundation, "the traditions" of this Orange Society, is so appalling, that we are anxious only to doubt; conviction is so terrible that the human Christian mind seeks in every way to escape from it, ~~to elude it.~~

Unfortunately we cannot remain in doubt, for we find in the report* of a Committee of the House of Commons, appointed in 1835 to inquire into the constitutions of the Orange Society, and the evidence taken before it, that "*in nearly all the northern counties the houses of Catholics were, in 1795, and subsequent years, wrecked, and the inhabitants driven to Connaught.*" Here is what Lord Camden, then Lord Lieutenant of Ireland, writes to the Duke of Portland: "The Protestants in the County Armagh, finding themselves the most numerous, have been induced to commit acts *of the greatest outrage and barbarity* against their Catholic neighbours." This was in January, 1796.

But this is not all, for we have also the account of what occurred given in the verified address of Lord Gosford, Governor of Armagh county, in December, 1795, at quarter sessions. "*Neither age*

* *Edinburgh Review*, January, 1836—Report of evidence taken before Committee of House of Commons, 1835.

nor sex, nor even acknowledged innocence as to any guilt in connection with late disturbances, is sufficient to excite mercy, much less to afford protection. The only crime which the objects of this ruthless persecution are charged with is simply a profession of the Roman Catholic religion. A lawless banditti have constituted themselves judges of this new species of delinquency. More than half the inhabitants of a populous country are deprived at one blow of the means as well as the fruits of their industry, and driven in the midst of an inclement winter to seek a shelter for themselves and helpless families where chance may guide them."

Here there can be no exaggeration or bias—in all this there is no room for doubt !

What ! after centuries of merciless persecution the laws allow Catholics certain rights over property. Was this a breach of the privileges of the Ulster Protestants of 1795—of the Orangemen ? When the eyes of our rulers were opened to the wickedness and folly of trying, by bribery, fine, confiscation, imprisonment, and even the penalties of high treason itself, to turn Irishmen from their creed—the law respected their fortitude and gave them a right to live unmolested. Was this a breach of the privileges of the Orangemen ?

Such, then, are the *memories* the *traditions* of the Orange Society of Ulster—such are the *memories* carefully transmitted in many an Ulster home

to the present opponents of local government. Lord Randolph Churchill's words are "all those memories"—*all*—the murders and burnings, the triangles, the whip, and the rope, of 1795, 1796, 1797—the memories of these brave doings (doings which won for Wolfe Tone his most sturdy adherents) are carefully treasured up and now inspire the last defence against the grant of local government to Irishmen!

"Your motto, your pass-word, and your sign has been No Surrender (loud cheers)." True, too true of 1795 and the years immediately following—"No Surrender" of the right of being the sole free occupiers of the soil of Ulster—"No Surrender" to the demand for equality of fellow-Christians—"No Surrender" *then as now* to any enactment of the legislature in their favour.

Such was the society, such are the memories and traditions, in whose name Lord Churchill appeals in this nineteenth century to the sectarian hate of the Orangemen—appeals to them to oppose the grant of local government to this country. And it is men who can listen to and cheer such an appeal, but who fortunately have dwindled down until they became a mere fraction of the Protestant inhabitants of Ulster, it is such men, inspired by such motives, who dare to appeal to the democracy of England, threatening insurrections should "deeds the most astounding" fail to cow the British people and their great leader. But times are changed since 1795,

and the first attempt “*to trim the lamp of civil and religious liberty*”—to carry into practice the Orange theory, to prove “*their memories living and their forms and ceremonies more than mere names*”—would be so met by the police authorities that they would never attain to deeds more resounding than a meeting in an Ulster Hall, which would, doubtless, “resound” with Orange cheers.

And all these threats of mighty deeds and civil war prove only that the Dean of Clonfert, himself an Orangeman, was right in saying the Orangemen of Ulster would, by talking of civil war, be led into idle bravado.

And, small as is the party of Orangeism, a large section of it is ready to accept and make the best of Home Rule, and entertains no doubt of the good faith or conduct of the Nationalists. For, as their mouthpiece, speaking of Home Rule to the Derry Orangemen on the 19th December (the anniversary of the shutting of the gates of Derry), the Dean of Clonfert said: “We (the Orangemen) have no reason to attribute to the majority in this country any desire to oppress the minority so as to excite civil war. For them to do so, with the power of England at hand, and the Queen’s troops actually garrisoning the country, would, apparently, be a blunder too gross to be committed by one of the shrewdest and most quick-witted of European races, acting under such able leaders.”

And such are the real opinions of even the

Orangemen, despite the bluster and idle bravado of the Belfast squad.

It is hard for people of average intelligence to comprehend how the Orange bluster as to insurrection, so freely indulged in of late by some of the lodges, and in particular, oddly enough, since the Conservatives decided on not propounding a measure of local government for Ireland, how this bluster could gain over anyone to the unreasoning opposition to an Irish parliament. And yet, in the pamphlet of their follower, Dr. Maguire, really a parody on England's duty to Ireland, you have an example of the effect of bluster on some minds. In it the zealous recruit surpasses, in the blood-thirstiness and degradation of his ideas, the regular soldiers of the Orange camp. The words appear strong, but before I conclude you will admit their truth; they are the only words which with justice could be used.

ONE would expect to find in a pamphlet bearing on the title-page the words "Duty" and "Loyal," something to show that the writer was at least capable of understanding the meaning of those words, that his was a nature to be swayed by a sense of duty and loyalty, or at least that he could do justice to the conduct of those with whom duty and loyalty are more than mere words, and for whom they contain, in the virtues, sentiments, and aspirations they express, all that could give freedom and security to the citizen—unity and greatness to the State! From one who acknowledges himself a member of a great Christian Church, we might not unreasonably look for some sign of Christian or religious feeling! A Professor of Moral Philosophy writing on a nation's claim for self-government should give us a treatise worthy of his great University, a record of thoughts, research, and reasoning, deserving the consideration of the thinking people of England and of England's tribune! Nay, more, the Irish "Doctor of Literature" must surely charm his readers by the elegance of his style, the delicacy of his fancy, and the refinement of his diction—and his essay so add yet another to the literary gems of our century. Well, you will

find nothing of all this in the contents ; you can discover no trace of Christian, loyalist, philosopher, or doctor of literature, in this collection of words and statements by Mr. Maguire. I shall call attention to a few of these which have not been dealt with by the Rev. John Behan, in his reply, premising that I do so because a fictitious value may be given to this tirade against Home Rule, owing to the religion and supposed position in Trinity College of the writer. Before dealing with the sentences in which Dr. Maguire discloses the nature of the opposition to, and the consequences of the grant of, Home Rule, I wish to say a few words about his statement that the Irish are disintegrated by religious differences.

Taking that statement in connection with what follows I assume it means that there is hostility between Protestants, as such, and those who differ from them in religion, and that this hostility is peculiar to Ireland. If peculiar to Ireland it must be the creation of circumstances ; that is to say, it must have been developed by wrongs done to or by the Protestants as Protestants.

Now, going back as far as Catholic Emancipation, I think you have no evidence of wrong done, or insult offered to Protestants on account of their religion, which could possibly engender in their minds hostility to the members of a different Church. There are in Ireland four million Catholics, and about half a million Presbyterians and dissenters to some 600,000 Protestants ; and certainly amongst

the four millions and a-half there has been no sign of hostility towards the 600,000. It is easy to bring such a charge, but when made against four millions and a-half of people, if well founded, it should be easily substantiated. Therefore I shall consider that in making this statement Mr. Maguire means that the 600,000 Protestants entertain a feeling of hostility against the rest of the community. But of this, either, Mr. Maguire gives us no proof; here, however, I suppose he relies on the declarations of the Orangemen of Ulster. But that will not carry him very far, for in all Ulster there were in 1881 but 379,000 Protestants (they are fewer now), and only a small section of those belong to the Orange Society. According to Lord Randolph Churchill they have lost all weight in half Ulster. Then, coming to the non-Orange Protestants, I challenge the accuracy of the statement. Have we not seen the Protestant and Catholic side by side on the one platform, working in the same cause? Have we not seen the bishops and clergy of the one Church supporting a candidate who differed from them in creed, in opposition to a co-religionist? In the very organ of the Protestants and Orangemen of Ireland you have it asserted that "Protestants are thoroughly satisfied to live on terms of political and social equality with their Roman Catholic neighbours." * Is all this disintegration? Can we not read in the

* *Daily Express*, 23rd February, 1886.

past, and see in the present, how the Irish people have considered only the *principles*, not the *creed*, of their representatives—yes, and of their *leaders*? All are Christians, worshipping the one God, with belief in the one Redeemer, respecting each the other's faith.

And this sentiment exists generally—(outside the Orange Society)—it is not the growth of an agitation or of even half a century. I assert it boldly; for the credit of the country it should be known—known wherever the blast of the Orange trumpet, where the mutterings of the enlightened moral philosopher reach! I don't assert it without reason, for I think I prove my case (after all only that at least ten-elevenths of my countrymen are possessed of reason and true religious feeling) by proving that feelings of kindness and honour on the one side, and confidence on the other were *common* as between Protestant and Catholic *in the darkest days of the penal times*.

I wrote of the Orange Society, its memories and traditions, with regret and a feeling of shame for those who, by glorying in such memories and traditions, proved themselves to be insensible to shame; but it is with heartfelt pleasure that I now speak of far different memories and traditions, preserved in many a Catholic home throughout three provinces. When the rights of Catholics in land were destroyed—when their heritage became liable to confiscation—the Protestant neighbour stepped in and took the

land and property “on trust” or “confidence” for the Catholic and his family. Such acts were general ! We have abundant evidence of this in the recitals* and enactments of many of the penal statutes, framed especially to meet such cases ; and notwithstanding bribes of theretofore unheard-of magnitude, I have never read of a single case in which the “trust” or “confidence” of the Catholic was betrayed by the Protestant.

Trust and confidence never betrayed ! There indeed is a tradition to blast for ever the evil hopes or wishes of those who seek now to trade on the existence of sectarian hate or rancour ! There is a memory which, doubtless, with the spread of education, brought the once powerful Orange body to its present state of weakness ; for many must have fallen away from, and none could have joined, a society which existed only to nourish sectarian hate and keep alive memories of times which enlightened Protestants look back upon with horror.

* 8 Anne, ch. 3, sec. 27. After reciting “that certain acts against the purchase, securing, or leasing of lands by Papists, have been most notoriously eluded by several Papists *and others* in trust for them,” declared such securities void, and “the lands, etc., thereby dealt with may be sued for by any Protestant ; and the plaintiff, upon proof that such purchase . . . was made *in trust or under any confidence to or for any Papist or for his benefit*, shall obtain judgment and be put in possession of same according to the estate, trust, or confidence which the Papist had or should have had therein, had he been qualified to purchase, hold, or enjoy the same.”

The Orange Society, therefore, such as it is, contains within itself all who entertain hostility to another on account of creed—and I make Dr. Maguire a present of this society—not being without hope that, as bluster proves unavailing to prevent the true union of the democracies of England and Ireland by the grant of self-government to the latter, the Orangemen may give up their old world prejudices and act as loyal citizens of the State.

Dr. Maguire asserts that, through want of education, the Irish are incapable of being influenced by argument, and this because the Protestant and Catholic Churches entered into an evil combination (? disintegration) to prevent the exclusion of religion from primary education. Now Dr. Maguire's opinion, accompanied as it is by a sneer at the minister, the Bible, and that creed to which he himself professes to belong, can carry little weight, and will hardly promote the interests of secular primary education, of which system the professor of moral philosophy is possibly himself the victim. However that may be, the century which has elapsed since the repeal of the acts for the prevention of education has left "one of the shrewdest and most quick-witted of European races" at least so far educated as to be above indulgence in bigotry.

The one paragraph in this pamphlet with which I am chiefly concerned, as evidencing the nature of the opposition to Home Rule, sufficiently proves that this petty minority relies not on justice, reason,

or fact, but on the constant bringing against the Nationalists of charges terrible in their character—charges which in different words have been “dinned into the ears” of the English people by Orange orators, who in their detraction did not condescend to any attempt to justify or prove. Dr. Maguire is above such conduct. True, with brutal conciseness he gives utterance to the extract and essence of Orange calumny when he avers (p. 9) “that Home Rule means the massacre of the loyalists(?)”—but then this champion of Orange intolerance is a professor of moral philosophy and a doctor of laws, and so he undertakes what no one had before been foolish enough to attempt—undertakes to justify his charge.

The reasons, which he gives in the one paragraph with the charge, I give in Dr. Maguire’s own words. In the event of Home Rule being granted (or, as he words it, in the event of the Imperial Government giving up Ireland), he says, (p. 10):—
 “There is no doubt that the *loyalist minority*. . . . with the help from the sister island of volunteers, relations, friends, and adventurous spirits who now shoot bears and tigers, would give the Nationalists a lesson they would remember when Strafford and Cromwell are names as shadowy as Con and Brian Boru.” Had he used the word minority without the adjective loyalist one could admit that in a sense he made out his case. Thus:—

Home Rule is to be followed by the giving of a lesson, shooting down the Nationalists.

The Nationalists are loyalists.

Therefore, Home Rule means the massacre of the loyalists.—Q. E. D.

But by the insertion of this adjective it reads—Home Rule is to be followed by shooting down of people by loyalists; therefore, Home Rule means the massacre of the loyalists: a conclusion which can hardly recommend itself to the thirty odd millions into whose ears Dr. Maguire wished the calumny to be dinned.

But what is the minority to do if Home Rule be granted? and what is the character of this promised lesson? He speaks of Cromwell! *How then is Cromwell remembered?*

In 1649, the Irish claimed for themselves religious freedom, and we know from Carlyle, his admirer and eulogist, how Cromwell met this claim. * “Here are Acts of Parliament, methods of regulation and veracity, emblems the nearest we Puritans could make them of God’s law book. *Refuse to obey them. I will not let you continue living.*” Such were Cromwell’s conditions—a refusal of which was invariably followed by storm and slaughter—and Carlyle’s sole comment is “not bluster this.”

We find Cromwell, on the 17th September, 1649, writing to Lenthall, the Speaker of the Parliament, of the taking of Tredah or Drogheda, and “the slaughter of the whole number of the defendants.”

* Cromwell’s Letters, by Carlyle, p. 452.

He goes on, "About 100 officers and soldiers who fled possessed St. Peter's church steeple, some the West Gate, and others a strong round tower. These being summoned, refused. Whereupon *I ordered the steeple of St. Peter's Church to be fired, when one of them was heard to say in the midst of the flames, 'G—damn me, G—confound me, I burn, I burn.'*" As to one of the other towers, he wrote, "When they submitted, their officers were knocked on the head, and every tenth man of the soldiers killed, and the rest shipped for Barbadoes."

As a supplement to Cromwell's letter, I give at foot hereof the narrative of one of his officers, Capt. Thomas Wood, who was present at the sack of Drogheda—it is to be found in the Autobiography of Anthony Wood, which is prefixed to Bliss' Edn. of Woods, *Athenæ Oxonienses*.*

* After describing how 3,000 at least, besides women and children, were put to the sword on the 11th and 17th September, 1649, it continues "When they were to make their way up to the lofts and galleries in the church, and up to the tower where the enemy had fled, each of the assailants would take up a child and use it as a buckler of defence, when they ascended the steps, to keep themselves from being shot or brained. After they had killed all in the churches they went into the vaults underneath, where all the flower and choicest of the women and ladies had hid themselves. One of these, a most handsome virgin arraid in most costly and gorgeous apparel, kneel'd down to Tho. Wood with teares and prayers, to save her life; and he, being stricken with a profound pitie, took her under his arme, went with her out of the church with intention to put her over

From this, the history of a few days out of Cromwell's Irish Campaign, the Englishman can, to some extent, understand to what extremes the Dictator, who did so much to raise England's name abroad, was, in Ireland, carried away by fanaticism, and in what way he is remembered there. Speaking of Cromwell, Hallam says: *—"The conquest of Ireland was achieved by Cromwell and his powerful army with such bloodshed and rigour, that, in the opinion of Lord Clarendon, *the sufferings of that nation have never been surpassed but by those of the Jews, in their destruction by Titus.*"

What is there more terrible which the minds of Dr. Maguire and of this minority can conceive? I cannot even guess at what they point. We had rapine, slaughter, death by fire and sword following in Cromwell's train. What furies are to inspire those who, in this nineteenth century, in the face of civilisation, threaten deeds so cruel as to make us forget all this?

What memories are to replace those which, in Ireland, hang round the name of Cromwell, leaving it a curse in the mouth of the peasantry? I can write of Cromwell, but I am utterly incapable

the works to shift for herself; Mr. Wood seeing her gasping but a soldier perceiving his intentions he ran his sword &c., and flung her down over up her body. Whereupon the works, &c."

* Hallam's Const. His., vol. III., p. 346.

of gauging the black depths of the abyss of blood and infamy in which the imaginations of Dr. Maguire and his Orange allies revel in the delirium of their senseless hate of the well-wishers of their country.

And, yet, this is the "reason" given by Dr. Maguire, and running through the speeches of Lord Randolph Churchill, and the underlying bluster of the Orange Lodges : *what the learned doctor calls a lesson, and Lord Churchill Orange insurrection !* Threats of insurrection are not sufficiently strong for some Orange palates, though Lord Churchill cannot be induced to go further. So the five millions of Irishmen are to be taught a *lesson !*

I shall not venture to describe the style of venomous scurrility in which this gentleman and Catholic vilifies the distinguished ecclesiastics of his own Church, the able men who represent in Parliament the cause of Ireland, and the four millions of Irishmen and women who are guilty of wishing to enjoy the rights of self-government. No words of mine could increase the feelings of contemptuous disgust with which those who *have* read his sentences must regard the writer, and to those who have not yet read this statement of "England's Duty to Ireland," I say, "Don't read it," unless, indeed, you entertain doubts as to the propriety of granting self-government to Ireland, which its perusal would surely remove.

The Most Rev. Dr. Walsh, the distinguished and

able Archbishop of Dublin, recently mentioned, in the course of an address, that politics were altogether apart from religion, and that they should not be confused. This is converted by Dr. Maguire into a *permission* to Catholics* to choose their politics, apparently for the purpose of giving this Catholic an opportunity of regretting the repeal of the penal laws.

I spoke of the venomous scurrility of the writer, and the contemptuous disgust with which his writing must be regarded. The expressions *are* strong, but fail to adequately express the nature of the language used by this professor of moral philosophy ! Hard pushed indeed must this trained scholar and advocate of the Orange opposition have been for argument or reason when he attempts to forward his cause, and delay for awhile the grant of self-government to a nation, by branding the beauty and grace, the womanhood of Ireland, as being "more ferocious than *les lècheuses*," and Dr. Maguire † now explains that by this he means that they are "*women more ferocious than the women who danced round the guillotine and licked the blood as*

* As to the loyalty of the Irish Catholics to the Crown: it is right to mention that, at the most solemn portion of the Mass, priest and people pray for *our Queen* and *our rulers*. See "Key of Heaven," "Catholic Piety," and other Catholic books of prayer.

† Letter of 6th March, 1886, Dr. Maguire to Editor, *Free-man's Journal*.

it trickled from the scaffold." And 'tis men who accept this man as their advocate, who adopt and give wide circulation to such a pamphlet, who, doubtless, furnished their advocate with the brief on which his "statement" of their case is based, *who form the minority, the first and last defence against the advancement of their country.* It would be an abuse of the ordinary meaning of the words, "degraded and infamous," to apply them to such language and such sentiments; the words do not exist in the English vocabulary to fitly characterise this shocking attempt, made or accepted by "the minority," to prejudice the Irish people at this crisis in their fate.

AND such is the nature of the opposition now offered to the demand of Ireland for self-government, a demand constitutionally expressed, a demand five-sixths of her representatives are instructed to press !

And what is this demand ? Simply that Ireland should get that on which is based the greatness of England, viz., *the great constitutional right of having her laws framed and her taxes imposed by her own representatives, and on her own soil.* Such a demand is in harmony with the letter and the spirit of the British Constitution.

For six and eighty years has Ireland been governed by either of the great English parties, her representatives having liberty only to go to London to state her wants, without the legislative power. For it is idle to say laws made in England by an assembly outnumbering Ireland's representatives by five to one are Irish-made laws ! And we find as a result that Ireland has suffered without England being served, that Ireland is over-taxed by three million a year without England (according to Mr. Giffen) being a gainer, that purely English legislation is almost at a stand-still, owing to the time taken up by Irish questions ; above all, *that the*

population of Ireland has since 1800 decreased by over half a million ; in a word, that the system of legislating for Ireland in Westminster is a failure, and that nothing can save Ireland from utter decay but the constitution itself, and its vital principle, representation !

The land question is the only cause of division in Ireland, and the suggestion of the *Daily News* to proceed simultaneously with measures for Home Rule and the expropriation of the landlords would get rid of this difficulty. And this final settlement of the land question would not lose Ireland a single member of what constitutes the resident landlord class—those landlords who reside on their demesnes, and spend their rents in this country. They will continue to occupy the mansion-houses of the country and to farm all lands in their own hands, receive their rents in the shape of dividends, and live on friendly terms with their one time tenants.

When Irishmen possess the power to legislate for their country, you may not find the bulk of even the Orangemen backward in trying to serve that country. Can you doubt this when you find one of their leaders addressing them in such terms as the following* : “In drawing together we must not withdraw ourselves from our fellow-countrymen. *If Ireland is to make laws for herself and manage her own affairs*, Ireland will, so far as those

* *Daily Express* report of the Dean of Clonfert’s address in Derry.

affairs are concerned, be the State of which we shall be citizens. *It will claim our patriotism ; and our best efforts should be given to promote the welfare of the whole Irish people?*" The Orange organ itself admitted the *Freeman's Journal* (the leading Irish newspaper) to be "very fair and reasonable in its tone," when it declared in its article of 18th October, 1885, that "the essential element in the success of any scheme of Home Rule is that it should be broad enough to be final, and that it should be generous enough to give to the Irish people a reasonable chance of restoring prosperity to this unhappy country."

Grattan, the Irish Demosthenes and impassioned advocate of Catholic Emancipation, in almost his last speech before Ireland lost the power (she never lost the right) to make her own laws, foreseeing the state of weakness, almost of ruin, to which she has been reduced by the loss of self-government, exclaimed, "Yet I do not give up the country : I see her in a swoon, but she is not dead : though in her tomb she lies helpless and motionless, still there is on her lips a spirit of life, and on her cheeks a glow of beauty." In a swoon, helpless, motionless ! Yes, so it was ! Helpless, indeed ; and if she moved, it was in a vain struggle, as that of one in sleep to cast off the nightmare which tortured and oppressed her. In a swoon she was, and in that long swoon has *lost all of increase ~~that~~ strength and wealth she would have won had she been conscious*

living mistress of herself, with mind to plan and ready limbs to execute !

Had it been otherwise, what myriads of her children's children, in constant swelling numbers, would now people her fields and towns !—what industries would have sprung up and flourished !—what fleets have filled her ports !

A swoon, indeed, far different from healthful, restful sleep ! But long as she has lain in that tomb, where she was consigned by the evil genius who conjured away the secret of her strength, great as has been her loss of vital power, she is not dead ! Not dead ! A greater magician, of a higher, nobler order, has cast his eyes upon our country, recognizes the baleful effects of this long trance, and with a word can break the spell, with the cordial of England's sympathy (which waits upon his will) can renew her strength, and make her a nation *thriving in herself, and adding power and unity to the British empire*. To that great statesman, who moves at will the minds and hearts of men by the fire, force, and persuasion of eloquence and genius, as much as by their belief in his honesty of purpose, Ireland now appeals for help—appeals by the voices of her children, whose tongues he has loosened—appeals by the memory of all she suffered in the past—appeals with the mute eloquence of suffering and decay—appeals for life, for justice. Misrepresentation, calumny, prejudice, fade away into nothingness

as he advances to bring back warmth to the heart and gladness to the eyes of our country.

There are four million Catholics in Ireland—therefore deny her justice ! deny her the constitution ! And this is the argument addressed to Englishmen in the nineteenth century—addressed to the leader who has spent his life in the service of the State. Fools ! fools ! Do not the long centuries of bitter, deadly, unceasing persecution now plead powerfully with enlightened England for the Irish Catholics, and render it almost impossible that they should be refused *anything* in reparation ? And when it is but their *right* which they demand, what fear of a refusal ?

As the heart is to the body, so is the legislature to the State—in the British constitution. And Mr. Gladstone has but to apply his mind to the task, and once again will Ireland's heart throb in College Green, and send the rich blood of health coursing through her arteries and veins, animating the country to its extremest limits ; and the name of Gladstone will go down to posterity as that of one who was enabled, by his transcendent genius and his ascendancy over the hearts and minds of his countrymen, to restore life to the Irish nation—freedom and prosperity to five millions of people.

p. 5

